



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/448,804	11/24/1999	DAVID L. SALGADO	D/99253-690	5473

2512 7590 04/19/2011
Perman & Green, LLP
99 Hawley Lane
Stratford, CT 06614

EXAMINER

PANNALA, SATHYANARAYA R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2164

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

04/19/2011

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/448,804	SALGADO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Sathyanarayan Pannala	2164	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 February 2011.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's Amendment filed on 2/9/2011 has been entered with amended claims 1, 3-7, 9-12, 15 and no added or cancelled claims. In this Office Action, claims 1-21 are pending.

Specification

2. Applicant's specification amendment filed on 2/9/2011 is objected. Because it is a copy of the amended independent claims. Therefore, it will not be entered. The **summary of the invention** is objected because it is a copy of independent claims. A revised summary is required without adding new matter and that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. See MPEP §§ 608.01(d).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3. 35 U.S.C. § 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

4. Claims 1-2 and 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101, because claims are directed to software per se. Independent claims 1 and 12 are claiming computer software per se and functional descriptive material consisting of data structures and computer programs, which impart functionality when employed as a computer component. As such, the claim fails to show linkage between the hardware and the software steps so as to be structurally and functionally interrelated and permit the function of the software steps to be realized. Since software steps are merely set of instructions without proper linkage with the hardware to realize the software steps' functionality, it is regarded as nonstatutory. Claims 2 and 13-14 depend on claims 1 and 12 respectively and they are also rejected under the same rationale as claims 1 and 12. See *Diehr*, 450 U.S. at 185-86, 209 USPQ at 8.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was

commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claims 1-2, 15-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujiwara (US Patent 6,301,710) hereinafter Fujiwara, and in view of Tsumura (US Patent 5,842,023) hereinafter Tsumura.

7. As per independent claim 1, Fujiwara teaches the claimed, a multiple platform architecture data reporting system for managing attribute data in a document processing apparatus, the system, embodied on a non-transitory computer readable medium in the document processing apparatus (Fig. 2, col. 1, lines 20-23, **computer software programs and architecture and relates to a system and method for creating substitute registry when automatically installing an update program**), comprising:
a system manager stored on said non-transitory computer readable medium of said data processing apparatus (col. 2, lines 35-38, **a client computer from a client-server system preferably contains several software programs** including a client applications, server middleware, and a browser program); and at least one platform controller stored on said non-transitory computer readable medium of said data processing apparatus, coupled to the system manager (col. 1, lines 29-31, **computer**

software programs typically include a series of instructions that control the operation and functionality of computer systems) the system manager configured to: collect attribute data including copyright data pertaining to software from each platform controller (Fig. 4, col. 6, lines 15-16 and lines 22-24, **the browser program may possess selected attributes from client configuration files 340 may include information regarding the system directories or system registries for client software and other information currently residing on client 120**); process in a processor the copyright data into a list of copyright data for the system (Fig. 9, col. 10, lines 18-21, **download module 430 preferably performs a comparison procedure between one or more download files 420 listed on network page 410 and the software programs currently installed on client 120**); and a user interface connected to the system manager for displaying the collected attribute data in the list to a user (Fig. 3, col. 6, lines 51-53, **viewed and accessed by a system user by displaying client registries 355 on a graphical user interface (GUI) of client 120**).

Fujiwara does not explicitly teach, recognize the copyright data in the attribute data. However, Tsumura teaches the claimed, recognize the copyright data in the attribute data (Fig. 5, col. 3, lines 14-26, **at box 5, the supply of information is appropriately controlled by the region controller, the copyright information manager and the controller employs the entire processor to determine whether or not the purpose of a user and the format in use match the conditions specified by the information provider and that are included in the attribute data.**) Thus, it would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of the cited references because Fujiwara's teachings would have allowed Tsumura's system would the protection of copyrights and the security of information (col. 1, lines 27-28).

8. As per dependent claim 2, Fujiwara teaches the claimed, the multiple platform architecture data reporting system as in claim 1 wherein the system manager comprises memory for storing attribute data collected by the system manager (Fig. 2-3, lines 51-55, **non-volatile memory 240 preferably includes a client application 310, middleware 320, middleware 325, a browser program 330, client configuration files 340, and client registries 355**).

9. As per dependent claim 15, Fujiwara teaches the claimed, the system manager collects attribute data from platform controller during power on of at least one of the at least two platform controllers (Fig. 4, col. 6, lines 15-16 and lines 22-24, **the browser program may possess selected attributes from client configuration files 340 may include information regarding the system directories or system registries for client software and other information currently residing on client 120**).

10. As per dependent claim 16, Fujiwara teaches the claimed, the attribute data collected is attribute data stored on each platform controller and is passed to the user interface" (Fig. 1, col. 4, lines 15-19, **client-server system 160 may typically include**

a substantially larger number of additional client systems. Each of the additional client systems is preferably likewise configured to communicate with database server 150 and network 100).

11. As per dependent claim 17, Fujiwara teaches the claimed “the list is a list of copyright years for the system in its entirety” as the attributes of the digital data the last update date (Fig. 6, col. 8, lines 3-5, **download module 430 then preferably compares the update module(s) listed on network page 410 and the software residing on client 120).**

12. As per dependent claim 18, Fujiwara teaches the claimed, the attribute data comprises copyright and license data related to software (Fig. 9, col. 10, lines 20-23, **miscellaneous information 918 may include, but is not limited to, a copyright notice, a license agreement, a description of the corresponding software, a user identification number, and a password).**

13. As per dependent claim 19, Fujiwara teaches the claimed “the attribute data is a list of copyright years related to each software object of the system (Fig. 6, col. 7, line 64 to col. 8, line 2, **Network page 410 preferably contains information relating to one or more update programs that may be appropriate for client 120. For**

example, network page 410 may contain the name and version number of one or more update programs that client 120 may wish to download and install).

14. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujiwara (US Patent 6,301,710) hereinafter Fujiwara, in view of Tsumura (US Patent 6,151,624) and in view of Saito (USPA Pub. 2002/0073035 A1) hereinafter Saito.

15. As per dependent claim 20, Fujiwara and Tsumura combined teaches independent claim 1. Fujiwara and Tsumura do not explicitly teach computer interfaced to copier, fax machine... However, Saito teaches the claimed, the document processing apparatus is a copier, a fax machine, a computer printer, a scanner or a multifunction device (Fig. 1, par. [0014], lines 2-61, **the apparatus related to data processing are a versatile computer, a scanner, a printer, a copying machine, a display device, a file server, a facsimile equipment, an external storage device, and others**). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of the cited references because Saito's teachings would have allowed Fujiwara's mechanism to integrate the counted values of the scanner and printer (page 1, par. [0008]).

16. Claims 3-7, 9-13 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujiwara (US Patent 6,301,710) hereinafter Fujiwara, and in view of Teare et al. (US Patent 6,151,624) hereinafter Teare.

17. As per independent claim 3, Fujiwara teaches the claimed, the method for managing attribute data in a document processing apparatus (col. 1, lines 20-23, **computer software programs and architecture and relates to a system and method for creating substitute registry when automatically installing an update program**), the method comprising:

Fujiwara teaches the claimed, displaying the collected attribute data on a user display of the document processing apparatus for managing attribute data in the document processing apparatus (Fig. 3, col. 6, lines 51-53, **viewed and accessed by a system user by displaying client registries 355 on a graphical user interface (GUI) of client 120**).

Fujiwara does not teach polling at least two platform controllers. However, Teare teaches the claimed, a system controller in the document processing apparatus polling at least two platform controllers in the document processing apparatus for attribute data (Fig. 3, col. 18, lines 18-21, **the crawler 24 polls the customer web site that is represented by the row or record, searching for updates to the Name File 64, stored in association with the web site**);

Teare also teaches the claimed, the system manager collecting the attribute data from the at least two platforms in response to the polling (see Abstract, **a copy of the metadata is stored in a registry that is indexed at a central location. A crawler service periodically updates the registry by polling the information on each server associated with registered metadata. To locate a selected network**

resource, a client provides the name of the network resource to a resolver process). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of the cited references because Teare's teachings would have allowed Fujiwara's mechanism to navigate to a network resource based upon its name and without misdirection caused by a meta-tag in the network resource (col. 4, lines 42-44).

18. As per dependent claim 4, Fujiwara and Teare combined teaches independent claim 3. Teare teaches the claimed, automatically polling the at least two platform controllers during power on of at least one of the at least two platform controllers (col. 5, lines 9-11, **another feature involves periodically polling the name file on the server associated with the client**). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of the cited references because Teare's teachings would have allowed Fujiwara's mechanism to navigate to a network resource based upon its name and without misdirection caused by a meta-tag in the network resource (col. 4, lines 42-44).

19. As per dependent claim 5, Fujiwara and Teare combined teaches independent claim 3. Teare teaches the claimed, the step of polling at least two platforms for attribute data further comprises polling at least one of the at least two platform controllers when polling is initiated by a user request (Fig. 3, col. 18, lines 21-24, **the copyright of digital data provided by the data providing device is inspected and the**

information is taken from the device during the polling step includes the steps of opening an HTTP connection to the Web site, requesting and receiving a copy of the Name File). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of the cited references because Teare's teachings would have allowed Fujiwara's mechanism to navigate to a network resource based upon its name and without misdirection caused by a meta-tag in the network resource (col. 4, lines 42-44).

20. As per dependent claim 6, Fujiwara teaches the claimed step of "the collecting the copyright information from the at least two platform controllers (Fig. 4, col. 6, lines 15-16 and lines 22-24, **the browser program may possess selected attributes from client configuration files 340 may include information regarding the system directories or system registries for client software and other information currently residing on client 120).**

21. As per dependent claim 7, Fujiwara teaches the claimed, the collecting the attribute data from the at least two platforms in response to the polling further comprises collecting the license information from the at least two platform controllers (Fig. 9, col. 10, lines 3-6, **miscellaneous information 918 may include, but is not limited to, a copyright notice, a license agreement, a description of the corresponding software, a user identification number, and a password).**

22. As per dependent claim 9, Fujiwara teaches the claimed, the displaying the collected attribute data on a user display further comprises automatically displaying the attribute data collected from the at least two platform controllers (Fig. 3, col. 6, lines 51-53, **viewed and accessed by a system user by displaying client registries 355 on a graphical user interface (GUI) of client 120**).

23. As per dependent claim 10, Fujiwara teaches the claimed, the displaying the collected attribute data on a user display further comprises manually displaying the attribute data collected from the at least two platforms (Fig. 3, col. 6, lines 51-53, **viewed and accessed by a system user by displaying client registries 355 on a graphical user interface (GUI) of client 120**).

24. As per dependent claim 11, Fujiwara teaches the claimed, the displaying the collected attribute data on a user display further comprises displaying only non-copyright attribute data collected from the at least two platforms (Fig. 9, col. 10, lines 20-23, **miscellaneous information 918 may include, but is not limited to, a copyright notice, a license agreement, a description of the corresponding software, a user identification number, and a password**).

25. As per independent claim 12, Fujiwara teaches the claimed, A software copyright information managing system embodied on a non-transitory computer readable medium for managing software copyright data in a data processing apparatus (col. 1, lines 20-23,

computer software programs and architecture and relates to a system and method for creating substitute registry when automatically installing an update program), the system comprising:

Fujiwara teaches the claimed, “a system manager stored on said non-transitory computer readable medium of said data processing apparatus (col. 2, lines 35-38, **a client computer from a client-server system preferably contains several software programs** including a client applications, server middleware, and a browser program), and at least one platform controller stored on said non-transitory computer readable medium of said data processing apparatus (col. 2, lines 35-38, **a client computer from a client-server system preferably contains several software programs** including a client applications, server middleware, and a browser program), said controller coupled to the system controller, the system controller being configured to collect the software copyright data stored on each platform controller” (Fig. 4, col. 6, lines 15-16 and lines 22-24, **the browser program may possess selected attributes from client configuration files 340 may include information regarding the system directories or system registries for client software and other information currently residing on client 120. Fig. 1, col. 7, lines 60-64, system user of client 120 (FIG. 1) accesses network page 410 by entering a corresponding network address or uniform resource locator (URL), and browser program 330 responsively connects client 120 to network page 410).**

Fujiwara teaches the claimed, a user interface connected to the system controller for displaying the software copyright data from the memory to a user (Fig. 3, col. 6,

lines 51-53, **viewed and accessed by a system user by displaying client registries 355 on a graphical user interface (GUI) of client 120).**

Fujiwara does not explicitly teach a system controller for collecting data. However, Teare teaches the claimed, a system controller being configured to collect the software copyright data stored on each platform controller (Fig. 1, col. 12, lines 41-43 and col. 18, lines 18-24, **the system then displays a Web page containing a form that enables the system to receive further information about the user, the Crawler 24 polls the customer Web site that is represented by the row or record, searching for updates to the Name File 64 that is stored in association with that Web site. The polling step includes the steps of opening an HTTP connection to the Web site, requesting and receiving a copy of the Name File).** Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of the cited references because Teare's teachings would have allowed Fujiwara's mechanism to navigate to a network resource based upon its name and without misdirection caused by a meta-tag in the network resource (col. 4, lines 42-44).

26. As per dependent claim 13, Fujiwara teaches the claimed, the system controller for collecting the software copyright data from multiple platforms further comprises a memory for storing the software copyright data collected by the system controller (Fig. 1, col. 4, lines 28-30, **client 120 preferably communicates bi-directionally with database server 150 to access and store various types of information).**

27. As per dependent claim 21, Fujiwara teaches the claimed “the attribute data comprising copyright data for each software object on each platform controller (Fig. 3, col. 6, lines 19-21, **client configuration files 340 may include information regarding the system directories or system registries for client software and other information currently residing on client 120**).

28. Claims 8 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujiwara (US Patent 6,301,710) hereinafter Fujiwara, in view of Teare et al. (US Patent 6,151,624) hereinafter Teare, and in view of Saito (USPA Pub. 2002/0073035) hereinafter Saito.

29. As per dependent claims 8, 14, Fujiwara and Teare combined teaches independent claims 3 and 12. Fujiwara and Teare do not teach computer interfaced to copier, fax machine... However, Saito teaches the claimed, the document processing apparatus is a copier, a fax machine, a computer printer, a scanner or a multifunction device (Fig. 1, par. [0014]), lines 2-61, **the apparatus related to data processing are a versatile computer, a scanner, a printer, a copying machine, a display device, a file server, a facsimile equipment, an external storage device, and others**). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of the cited references because Saito’s teachings would

have allowed Fujiwara's mechanism to integrate the counted values of the scanner and printer (page 1, par. [0008]).

Response to Arguments

30. Applicant's amendment filed on 2/9/2011 have been fully considered with respect to claims 1-21 but they are persuasive and details are:

a) Applicant's argument regarding Summary of the Invention objection stated as "The summary of the invention has been amended to confirm to the claims. It is submitted that it is no longer objectionable."

In response to Applicant argument, Examiner respectfully disagrees. Because, the Summary of the Invention is a repro of independent claims and it is objected.

b) Applicant's argument regarding claim 15 rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, 1st paragraph stated as "Claims 15 has been amended to delete 'simultaneously' and to recite the subject matter of page 5, lines 17-22. It is submitted that it now is supported by the description."

In response to Applicant argument, Examiner respectfully agrees and the rejection claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. 112, 1st paragraph, has been withdrawn after a thorough review.

c) The Examiner has rejected claims 1-2, and 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. 101. In brief, he states that the claims are directed to software per se which fails to show linkage between the software and hardware so as to permit the software to be realized. He cites Diamond, Comr. Pats. v. Diehr and Lutton, 209 USPQ 1, 8, as support for this rejection... Examiner is aware of any authority for the proposition of a required linkage between software and hardware, he is required to provide it.”

In response to Applicant argument, Examiner respectfully disagrees. Because, when the software is stored on a hard disk or a CD it will not work by itself. It needs hardware to use the software. Applicant has amended claimed in similar concept for example, “controller coupled to the system manager” and “process in a processor”. Applicant is aware about the requirement of linkage between software and hardware and amended accordingly. It is merely an argument and asking examiner to show the proof of requirement.

d) Applicant’s argument regarding claim 1 rejection under 35 USC 103(a), stated as “it is it is respectfully submitted that there is absolutely no disclosure of a system manager or a platform manager.”

In response to Applicant’s argument, Examiner respectfully disagrees. Because, the prior art by Fujiwara and Tsumara combined do teach the claimed part (col. 1, lines 29-31, Fujiwara teaches the claimed as, **computer software programs typically include a series of instructions that control the**

operation and functionality of computer systems and at Fig. 4, col. 6, lines 15-16 and lines 22-24, the browser program may possess selected attributes from client configuration files 340 may include information regarding the system directories or system registries for client software and other information currently residing on client 120). Applicant is expecting same terminology in the prior art, which is a very rare situation.

e) Further, Applicant's argument regarding claim 1 rejection that the difference between the claimed word "collect" and the prior art teaching word "possess".

In response to Applicant's argument, Examiner respectfully disagrees. Because, The Merriam Webster's one of the meaning provided for "possess" as "acquire". I strongly feel that "collect" means acquire. Therefore, there is no difference between prior art teaching and the claimed invention. In response to applicant's argument, a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then, it meets the claim.

f) Applicant's argument regarding claim 15 rejection under 35 USC 103(a), stated as "the cited portions of Fujiwara disclose a plurality of client systems.

However, they fail to disclose collecting attribute data during power on as claimed.”

In response to Applicant’s argument, Examiner respectfully disagrees. Because the prior art by Fujiwara teaches the claimed at Fig. 4, col. 6, lines 15-16 and lines 22-24 as, **the browser program may possess selected attributes from client configuration files 340 may include information regarding the system directories or system registries for client software and other information currently residing on client 120.**

Conclusion

31. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

32. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sathyanarayan Pannala whose telephone number is (571) 272-4115. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am - 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on (571) 272-4085. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Sathyanarayan Pannala/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2164

srp
April 14, 2011